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TRANSACTION COST AND THE VIABILITY OF RURAL FINANCIAL INTERMEDIARIES*
by
Teodoro S. Untalan and Carlos E. Cuevas**

## I. INTRODUCTION

1. RATIONALE AND OBJECTIVES OF THE STUDY

Transaction cost of banks is the cost incurred as banks perform the role of intermediator among savers and users of funds. This result from their operations in lending, in mobilizing funds, as well as from other operations, e.g., investments. Transaction cost includes administrative costs,
*Paper presented during the ACPC-PIDS-OSU sponsored seminarworkshop on "Financial Intermediation in the Rural Sector: Research Results and Policy Issues" held on 26-27 September 1988 at the Cuaderno Hall, Central Bank of the Philippines. This is part of a larger study on comparative bank analysis jointly conducted by the Agricultural Credit Policy Council (ACPC), Philippine Institute for Development Studies (PIDS), and Ohio State University (OSU). The project was coordinated by Dr. Mario B. Lamberte (PIDS) and Dr. V. Bruce J. Tolentino (ACPC).
**Respectively, Research Associate, PIDS and Professor, OSU. The views expressed in this study are those of the authors and do not necessarily reflect those of the Institute.
i.e., personnel and fixed cost, as well as risk-related costs that are normally encountered in dispensing and keeping these funds. Transaction cost is a vital aspect of the formal financial system because this affects the bank's operational capability and largely determines the bank's viability as an intermediary.

The process of intermediation is the result of banks' comparative advantage in bringing about a market mechanism for the efficient transfer of claims on resources from surplus units to deficit units. High transaction cost runs against this rationale and impedes the intermediary's efficiency in resource allocation and distribution.

Against the backdrop of the increasing need to provide credit to the agricultural sector, the continued existence of intermediaries in the rural sector is necessary. The present thrust of Philippine economic development of uplifting the income of rural families through the growth of the agricultural sector only serves to highlight the need for a continuous supply of credit to rural households. Over the years, the share of agricultural credit to total credit has substantially decined and yet agriculture has remained to be a very important source of livelihood for most filipinos considering that about 81 percent of Filipino families in the lowest 30 percent income class derive their income from agriculture (Tolentino, 1987).

In the past, attempts were made to infuse cheap funds into the rural sector through the formal financial system with the
hope that the availability of credit could stimulate the development of the agricultural sector. While the intention of providing cheap credit is noble, it overlooks its adverse effects on the transaction cost of banks. Banks' cost of administering donor-sourced loans could be high, thus affecting their operations and compromising their viability (Cuevas, 1984). The recognition of this problem has recently led to some policy changes. Apart from ensuring the continuous flow of credit to the rural sector, the new set of policies also seeks to protect banks from incurring unnecessarily high intermediation costs.

This paper attempts to examine the transaction cost of banks. Its specific onjectives are:
(1) to develop a method of estimating transaction cost for each bank activity, i.e., lending cost, funds mobilization and general administration;
(2) to explain the differences and the composition of transaction cost among commercial banks (KBs), private development banks (PDBs), and rural banks (RBs).

Recognizing the need to continually introduce improvements for the efficient functioning of the formal financial system as a sector vital to economic growth, knowledge of banks' transaction cost is important. It can serve as a policy benchmark on which future changes and improvements in the financial system car be based. These may in turn induce banks to assume a wider role in the whole financial process ensuring a stable flow of credit to the rural sector.
2. ORGANIZATION OF THE STUDY

Section II discusses the components of bank cost. A detailed presentation of the methods and procedures of estimating the transaction cost of banks and a description of the sources and limitations of data are given in section III. Section IV presents the empirical findings of the study. Finally, Section $V$ summarizes the results and discusses some policy implications.

## II. CONCEPTUAL ISSUES

A bank incurs costs in the process of mobilizing and lending funds. These costs may be grouped into three categories. First is the interest cost paid to its depositors, or its interest cost. Second, are the incidental expenses incurred such as insurance for its deposits, insurance premia for its loans, as well as fines and penalties. Finally, banks have administrative costs such as the salaries and depreciation cost to bank premises, furniture, fixtures, and equipments, etc.

These costs together with the interest cost of funds determine the overall costs or total cost of intermediation for a bank.

The bank's transaction cost can be summarized as,

TCost $=L \operatorname{Cos} t+F \operatorname{Cos} t+G \operatorname{Cos} t+O \operatorname{Cos} t$
where,

> TCost $=$ transaction cost of the bank
> LCost $=$ lending cost
> Fcost $=$ funds-mobilization cost
> GCost $=$ general administration cost
> Ocost $=$ other operational costs, e.g. investments

1. COST OF FUNDS

The bank incurs financial expenses in the form of interest payments paid to depositors. Similarly, the bank pays interest on funds obtained from the Central Bank rediscounting window,
borrowings from other banks, and/or special lending programs. These are the bank's pure cost of funds or interest cost.

## 2. INCIDENTAL EXPENSES

In its lending operations, the bank incurs risk-related costs for its loan delivery and recovery. These may at times come in the form of guarantee fees or insurance premia applicable to particular loans in the bank's portfolio when it participates with the special lending programs. These are necessary costs for the banks as a form of additional security against defaults or bad debts. In addition, banks also incur costs in the provisions for bad debts, or loan default itself as well as litigation expenses associated with the foreclosing on loan collateral.

The bank also incurs incidental expenses in its fundsmobilization such as deposit insurance, and the fines and penalties paid by the bank when it cannot meet the reserve requirements.

## 3. ADMINISTRATIVE COSTS

In performing its funds-mobilization and lending operations, banks incur variable and fixed expenses. On the fundsmobilization side, variable expenses correspond to the salaries paid to personnel involved in the bank's deposit-taking and borrowing operations. Fixed costs associated with funds mobilization are its share of depreciation costs on building, fixtures and equipments used in the bank's operation and other overhead expenses.

Similarly, administrative expenses such as salaries for personnel involved in loan processing, supervision, monitoring, and collection activities are incurred in the bank's lending operations. These also have their counterpart in the depreciation costs of the building, fixtures and equipment as well as overhead expenses.

There are administrative costs of the bank which are clearly identifiable in terms of costs to its lending operations and cost to its deposit-mobilization activities. Where other costs cannot be directly or specifically associated with any of the bank's major activities, then these are considered as general administration costs which are incurred in other operations by the bank. In the same manner as funds-mobilization and lending costs, these include salaries for personnel involved in general administrative work, and depreciation cost for the building, fixtures and equipments and other expenses related to such operations.

## 4. OPPORTUNITY COST OF FUNDS

Imputed costs of funds result from the opportunity cost of funds locked in loans overdue. Similarly, opportunity costs may be imputed by some banks due to the differences in the required reserves for these banks. Computation may be based on the market cost of funds applied to the total volume of funds under consideration. However, this cost is not considered in this study.

## III. METHODS AND PROCEDURES

This section presents the methods and procedures used in estimating the transaction cost of banks from the set of primary data.

1. TIME-ALLOCATION AND TRANSACTION COST

A table of time-allocation for the different functions in a bank was completed by each bank staff. Each staff was asked to give, in percentages, the time allocated to each of the preidentified bank activities (Appendix 1). A corresponding personnel compensation table was completed with the monthly salary for each bank staff.

From these initial data, estimation of the values for transaction cost for each bank is done by first, giving weights to the percentage of time allocated by each personnel by using the salary of that personnel from the personnel compensation table (Table 1). This is done by multiplying the time allocation of one personnel for the different bank activities (Table 1-A) by his corresponding salary (Table 1-B).

In order to reduce the number of variables needed in processing the data, bank personnel or positions were grouped into classes having the same or similar functions and were assigned one variable (Appendix 2). The guidelines followed are given in Appendix 3.

From the weighted percentages of time-allocation provided by each bank personnel for the different bank functions, a horizon-

## Table 1

| Bank Activity/ Function* | Bank Personne 1 |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Manager | Accountant | Teller |
| A. Lending ( $1-10$ ) | 50\% | 70\% |  |
| B. Investments |  |  |  |
| C. Trust |  |  |  |
| D. Funds-Mobilization (1-5) | 50\% | 30\% | 100\% |
| E. Gene. Administration |  |  |  |
| Total: | 100\% | 100\% | 100\% |
| See Appendix 1 for breakdown. |  |  |  |

B. Personnel Compensation Table

1. Manager
1,000
2. Accountant
\& 700
3. Teller

P 500
tal summation for each function across all bank personnel was made. Using this weighted time-allocation for each bank activity, the percent share of each function was taken from the total (Table 2-A).

Columns (1), (2), and (3) show the weighted time allocation in pesos for the different positions. summing up the weighted time allocation for each bank activity across all bank personnel, this total is given in column (4). The percentages in column (5) are then derived by taking the share of each bank activity to the total as given in column (4).

The resulting shares in percentages were used to allocate personnel costs i.e., salaries, and non-personnel costs, i.e., depreciation from the bank's income and expense statements (Table 2-B). For other expense items appearing in the income and expense statements which are clearly identifiable with specific bank activities, e.g., deposit insurance or guarantee fees, these are immediately allocated to that particular bank activity (Table 3). Column (1) gives the share of each bank activity in the total expenses on personnel, i.e., salaries, benefits, bonuses for each bank activity. In this case, column ( 1, item $A$ ) is the share of the bank's lending operations in the total expenses on bank personnel. In the same manner, the share of each bank activity in the bank's non-personnel expenses, i.e., depreciation, taxes are given in column (3). Column. (2) is the direct allocation of costs specific of a bank activity. For example, insurance premia is directly attributed to lending cost

## Table 2

A. Weighted Time-Allocation Table

| Bank Activity/ Function | Bank Personnel |  |  | Tota 1 |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Manager $\qquad$ (1) | untant _(2) | $11 \mathrm{er}$ | (4) | (5) |
| A. Lending | P500 | P490 |  | 19990 | 45\% |
| B. Investment |  |  |  |  |  |
| C. Trust |  |  |  |  |  |
| D. Funds-Mobilization | ion 2500 | R210 | 2500 | 21210 | 55\% |
| E. Gene. Administration |  |  |  |  |  |
| Total: | P1000 | 2700 | P500 | 2200 | 100\% |

B. Bank's Income and Expense Statements
A. Salaries and Wages (Personnel)
B. Depreciation/Other Operating Expenses (Non-Personne1)

Table 3
Transaction Cost

| Bank Per <br> Activity/ <br> Function | rsonnel cost | Non-Personnel Cost |  | Tota 1 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | (1) | Exclusive $\qquad$ (2) $\qquad$ | Non-exclusive $\qquad$ (3) $\qquad$ | $\begin{gathered} P \\ (4) \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ |
| A.Lending | F | insurance premia | R | A \% |
| B. Investment | nt |  | 1 | B \% |
| C.Trust | F |  | 1 | C \% |
| D. Funds-Mobi | bi. 2 | deposit insurance | P | D \% |
| E.Gene.-Admi | dmi. F |  | F | E \% |
|  |  | Transa | action Cost | 100\% |

since these are costs related to lending. The sum of both personnel and non-personnel costs for each bank activity is given in column (4). The corresponding shares of each bank activity from the total is given in column (5).

Thus, from the foregoing:

Transaction Cost $($ TCost $)=A+B+C+D+E$. where,

A is the total cost of lending by the bank;
$B$ is the total cost for investment operations;
$C$ is the total cost for trust operations;
$D$ is the total cost for funds-mobilization; and
$E$ is the total cost for general administration.

The allocation or breakdown of the transaction cost for each major bank activity can then be derived by taking the shares of these activities in total costs.

## 2. SOURCES AND DESCRIPTION OF DATA

This study used a sample of 64 banks out of the total of 66 classified according to type; location, and class. Two of the total number of banks did not give any information related to the aspects which were considered in this study. Of this sample, 22 are rural banks, 17 are private development banks, and 25 are commercial banks. All of the banks sampled are located outside Metro-Manila or are considered as operating in a rural or suburban setting (See Appendix 4).

The data gathered were qualitative and quantitative responses to the survey questionnaire augmented by supporting documents such as income statements, balance sheets, and job descriptions. The data was from a single year from January to December 1986.

Raw data were obtained on the time-allocation of each personnel for the different functions of a bank. Each bank personne1 was represented as everyone is made to respond to the time-allocation table. The basic information obtained was the percentage of the time of each personnel allocated per function.

## 3. LIMITATIONS OF THE DATA

Quantitative responses from the set of primary data collected maybe partly qualitative in nature as these may depend on the respondent's interpretation of the question at hand and the time-frame. This maybe particularly true where the respondents were asked about the allocation of their time to the different bank activities. Nevertheless, their responses maybe considered as best estimates.

In addition, answer to such questions as loan as a percentage of collateral, and number of repeat borrowers serviced were based on best estimates by the respondent in cases where bank records were not readily available.

Lastly, data on bank expenses although lifted straight. from the banks' income and expense statements, may not exactly reflect actual costs incurred for some bank activities. This is particularly true for KBs and PDBs where loan processing costs may be undervalued since part of activities of processing a loan are done at the head office but these costs may not be properly accounted for by the branch. These might have produced biased estimates.

## IV. EMPIRICAL RESULTS

This section discusses several sets of results. First, subsection IV. 1 provides an overview of the transactions costs and the different composition of these costs among KBs , PDBs , and RBs. The next sub-sections, IV. 2 and IV.3, focus on the lending costs and funds-mobilization costs, respectively, among the different bank types. These sub-sections present the composition of the costs of lending and funds-mobilization, two of the banks major operations, and attempt to explain the differences in this composition across the three bank types.

Sub-sections IV. 4 and IV. 5 relate the costs of lending and funds mobilization to the respective number and value of loans and deposits, in order to determine the per unit cost of providing these services. The costs per loan and per deposit provide indication of the comparative advantage of different bank types in providing these services to their customers.

## 1. TOTAL TRANSACTION COST: A COMPARATIVE ANALYSIS

Forty-nine of the 66 banks and bank branches in the sample reported time-allocation tables and income statements. Of these 49 banks, 16 are rura 1 banks, 14 are private development banks and 19 are commercial banks.

Total transaction cost for the overall sample of forty nine banks combined are due primarily to funds-mobilization
activities, $49.8 \%$ (see Table 4). Transaction cost associated with lending operations account only for 27.9 percent of the total. Bank activities related to administrative and general services account for 20.9 percent of the total transaction cost, while the rest corresponds to other bank operations such as investment, 0.71 percent, and trust, 0.70 percent.

Transactions with bank depositors and clients represent almost one-half of the costs of funds-mobilization activities for these banks. This indicates that an important proportion of bank resources is allocated to raising funds from the public for their operations. Activities related to transactions between these banks and the Central Bank (CB) and other banks account for only 3.1 percent of total transaction cost. The disparity in these shares in costs underlines the preference by these banks to source their funds from the public rather than from other sources. However, the cost of mobilizing funds from the central Bank is not negligible, as is usually assumed.

In their lending operations, activities related to loan processing account for 8.5 percent of total transaction cost. A larger proportion (11.5\%) of their costs is attributed to loan recovery efforts. The latter suggests a cautious attitude towards lending and the banks' greater effort to recover funds.

It is noteworthy that banks incur minimal costs in promoting its lending activities. This suggests that banks do not really exert effort to attract prospective borrowers. Banks, on the other hand, incur higher costs relative to their total

Table 4. TRANSACTION COST
(in thousand pesos)

|  | ALL Bakis |  | 85 |  | P885 |  | R $\mathrm{R}_{5}$ |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Pe505 | 4 | Pesos | \% | Peges | 7 | Pe505 | \% |
| Total leanjur costs; | 20694.47 | 27.85 | 9503.33 | 19.72 | 5401.50 | 38.55 | 5789.64 | 47.83 |
| Plaming * Progr cmaing $^{\text {a }}$ | 1469,17 | 1.98 | 902.57 | 1.87 | 233.83 | 1.67 | 331.82 | 2.74 |
| Ads \% Prbat | 440.33 | 0.59 | 162.58 | 0.34 | 135.65 | 0.83 | 162.10 | 1.34 |
| Dis shur sement | 1054.60 | 1.42 | 412.11 | 0.86 | 286.98 | 2.05 | 355.51 | 2.94 |
| Ursperifjed | 2886.99 | 3.87 | 1129.10 | 2.34 | 677.85 | 4.84 | 1081.34 | 8.93 |
| Loan Processing: |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Interyjew of Applicants | 1646.16 | 2.22 | 693.84 | 1.44 | 446.38 | 3.19 | 505.94 | 4.18 |
| Credit Investigation | 2355.23 | 3.17 | 1883.04 | 2.46 | 709.32 | 5.06 | 460.87 | 3.81 |
| Evaluation * Andysis | 2305.38 | 3.10 | 1229.27 | 2.55 | 382.41 | 2.73 | 683.70 | 5.75 |
|  | 6307.780 | 8.49 | 3109.15 | 6.45 | 1538.11 | 10.98 | 1660.50 | 15.72 |
| Laon Recoyery: |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Menitering | 1054.95 | 1.42 | 641.08 | 1.33 | 212.43 | 1.52 | 201.44 | 1.66 |
| Collection | 1526. 89 | 2.06 | 518.33 | 1.08 | 560.75 | 4.00 | 447.60 | 3.70 |
| Record-keeping/kepert-writing | 2886.19 | 3.88 | 1148.54 | 2.38 | 880.90 | 6.29 | 856.75 | 7.18 |
| 枵t. of bad debts | 3062.59 | 4.13 | 1980.91 | 3.07 | 894.79 | 6.39 | 692.89 | 5.72 |
|  | 8536.63 | 11.49 | 3788.86 | 7.86 | 2549.08 | 18.19 | 2198.68 | 18.16 |
| IN4ESTMENTS | 569.19 | 0.77 | 83.71 | 0.17 | 272.89 | 1.95 | 212.59 | 1.76 |
| trust operations | 522.72 | 0.70 | 402.09 | 0.83 | 112.18 | 0.80 | 8.46 | 0.07 |
| 60YaL Fumos-naillization cests: | 37010.21 | 49.81 | 27241.05 | 56.53 | 5148.21 | 36.73 | 4622.95 | 38.19 |
| Transactions with C8, other banks | 2335.82 | 3.14 | 1250.52 | 2.60 | 274.40 | 1.96 | 810.90 | 6.70 |
| Transactions with Depositors | 17636.44 | 23.74 | 14223.77 | 29.52 | 2250.75 | 16.07 | 1161.92 | 9.60 |
| Recori-keeping | 9589.63 | 11.56 | 6443.37 | \$3.37 | 1293.56 | 9.23 | 852.68 | 7.04 |
| Funds-Transfer | 1529.69 | 2.06 | 1098.31 | 2.29 | 355.90 | 2.54 | 75.48 | 0.62 |
| Ads \& Promb | 2250.03 | 3.03 | . 1552.76 | 3.22 | 380.58 | 2.72 | 316.70 | 2.62 |
| Unspecified | 4663.80 | 6.28 | 2671.77 | 5.54 | 58.75 | 4.19 | 1405.27 | 11.61 |
| GEMERAL ADEIHISTRATION/SERUICES | 15502.65 | 20.87 | 10954.44 | 22.73 | 3077.32 | 23.97 | 1470.88 | 12.15 |
| tramgactions cosis: | 74299.23 | 100.00 | 48184.61 | 100.00 | 14010.1 | 100.00 | 12104.51 | 100.00 |

Source: Comparative Bank Study,1987.
transaction cost in its deposit mobilization activities, indicating that banks make a more serious effort in attracting depositors than borrowers. This is shown by the relative shares in total transaction cost of advertising and promotions cost specific to loans (0.6\%) against advertising and promotions cost specific to deposits (3.0\%).

Among types of banks, transaction cost on the average are highest among KBs, 民2.5M, followed by PDBs, P1M, with RBs having the lowest transaction cost, R.79M, (see Table 5). There is a greater dispersion in transaction cost among KBs, followed by PDBs then RBs. About 36.8 percent of the commercial banks surveyed have transaction cost above R2.5M. Most PDBs and. RBs. have transaction cost of $巨 1 M$ or less, respectively. This is to be expected since KBs have bigger operations than PDBs and RBs. They have more personnel allocated to providing various services to their clientele. A typical KB has on the average a staff of 22 with PDBs having 16 and RBs 16 including officers and management personnel (Table 6). KBs also have higher fixed costs, i.e., depreciation for their building and equipments. Another important contributing factor is the relatively higher salary scale of $K B$ personnel than either PDBs and RBs. This only serves to underscore that the size of the bank has a bearing on the magnitude of its transaction cost.

When the composition of transaction cost is compared among bank types (Table 4), it is found, more than half (56.5\%) of transaction cost of KBs come from funds-mobilization. Only 19.7

## Table 5. COMPARATIVE TRANSACTION COST (in thousand pesos)

|  | K $\mathrm{Br}_{5}$ |  | PDE5 |  | RB5 |  | $\begin{gathered} \text { GAM } \\ \text { TBTAL } \end{gathered}$ | K85 | PDB5 | R85 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| TRANSACTIOMS COST | Nusber | 2 | Number | \% | Nuaber | $\underline{1}$ |  | $x$ | $\underline{L}$ | \% |
| 500 : les5 | 0 | 0.00 | 3 | 21.43 | 3 | 18.75 | d | 0.00 | 50.00 | 50.00 |
| 1000 \& less | 1 | 5.26 | 6 | 42.86 | 8 | 50.00 | 15 | 6.67 | 40.00 | 53.33 |
| 1500 \& less | 1 | 5.26 | 2 | 14.29 | 5 | 31.25 | 5 | \$1.50 | 25.00 | 62.50 |
| 2000 \& less | 4 | 21.05 | 2 | 14.29 | 0 | 0.00 | 6 | 66.67 | 33.33 | 0.00 |
| 2500 \& less | 6 | 31.58 | 0 | 0.00 | 0 | 0.00 | 6 | 100.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 |
| $2500+$ | 7 | 36.84 | 1 | 7.14 | 0 | 0.00 | 8 | 87.50 | 12.50 | 0.00 |
| TBTAL: | 19 | 100 | 14 | 100 | 16 | 100 |  |  |  |  |


| ANG: | 2536.032 | 1000.721 | 798.582 |
| :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| SD: | 1020.332 | 640.038 | 345.788 |
| VAR: | 1041078 | 409649 | 119569 |

Source : Comparative Gank Study, 1997.

Table 6. PERSONNEE DISTRIBUTION

| PCode* | Inder | 4bs |  | Pilf |  | R4 |  | $\underset{\text { lotal }}{\text { lot }}$ | 8fotal | [8] | Puss | Hir |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  | Iuaber | 4 | luber | 1 | luaber | 8 |  |  | $\downarrow$ | 4 | 1 |
| 1 |  | 0 | 0.00 | 5 | 1.98 | 12 | 4.38 | 11 | 1.51 | 0.00 | 29.41 | 10.59 |
| 2 |  | 0 | 0.00 | 5 | 1.98 | 10 | 3.65 | 15 | 1.38 | 0.00 | 33.33 | 66.67 |
| 3 |  | 1 | 0.00 | 20 | 7.95 | 50 | 18.25 | 10 | 6.45 | 0.00 | 28.51 | 11.43 |
| 4 |  | 0 | 0.00 | 5 | 1.98 | 12 | 4.38 | 17 | 1.57 | 0.00 | 29.41 | 70.59 |
| 5 |  | 4 | 4.30 | 16 | 6.32 | 16 | 5.84 | 56 | 5.16 | 42.86 | 28.57 | 28.57 |
| 6 |  | 17 | 3.05 | 5 | 1.98 | 4 | 1.46 | 26 | 2.40 | 65.38 | 19.23 | 15.38 |
| 1 |  | 21 | 4.84 | 15 | 5.93 | 30 | 10.95 | 12 | 6.64 | 37.50 | 20.83 | 14.67 |
| 8 |  | 17 | 3.05 | 18 | 7.11 | 20 | 1.30 | 55 | 5.01 | 30.91 | 32.73 | 36.36 |
| 9 | 1 | 1 | 0.90 | 1 | 2.37 | 6 | 2.19 | 17 | 1.57 | 29.41 | 35.29 | 35.29 |
| 10 | P | 121 | 21.68 | 33 | 13.04 | 12 | 4.38 | 166 | 15.30 | 72.89 | 19.88 | 1.23 |
| 11 | P | 28 | 5.02 | 1 | 0.40 | 2 | 0.73 | 31 | 2.86 | 90.32 | 3.23 | 6.45 |
| 12 | P | 63 | 11.29 | 21 | 8.30 | 16 | 5.84 | 100 | 9.22 | 63.00 | 21.00 | 16.00 |
| 13 | $p$ | 4 | 1.30 | 9 | 3.56 | 0 | 0.00 | 33 | 3.04 | 22.13 | 27.21 | 0.00 |
| 14 | L | 20 | 3.58 | 16 | 6.32 | 21 | 7.66 | 57 | 5.25 | 35.09 | 28.07 | 36.84 |
| 15 | L | 12 | 2.15 | 13 | 5.14 | 14 | 5.11 | 39 | 3.59 | 30.17 | 33.33 | 35.90 |
| 16 | L |  | 0.00 | 1 | 0.40 | 14 | 5.11 | 15 | 1.38 | 0.00 | 6.67 | 93.33 |
| 17 | P | 11 | 1.97 | 3 | 1.19 | 0 | 0.00 | 16 | 1.29 | 78.57 | 21.63 | 0.00 |
| 18 |  | 2 | 0.36 | 1 | 0.40 | 5 | 1.82 | 8 | 0.14 | 25.00 | 12.50 | 62.50 |
| 19 |  | 178 | 31.90 | 48 | 18.97 | 19 | 6.93 | 245 | 22.58 | 72.65 | 19.59 | 1.76 |
| 20 | L | 2 | 0.36 | 1 | 1.58 | 5 | 1.82 | 11 | 1.01 | 18.18 | 36.36 | 45.45 |
| 21 | L | 0 | 0.00 | 5 | 1.98 | 4 | 1.46 | , | 0.83 | 0.00 | 55.56 | 4.44 |
| 22 |  | 0 | 0.00 | 0 | 0.00 | 1 | 0.36 | 1 | 0.09 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 100.00 |
| 23 | L | 0 | 0.00 | 1 | 0.40 | 0 | 0.00 | 1 | 0.09 | 0.00 | 100.00 | 0.00 |
| 4 |  | 1 | 0.18 | 2 | 0.19 | 1 | 0.36 | 4 | 0.37 | 25.00 | 50.00 | 25.00 |
| 25 |  | 6 | 1.08 | 0 | 0.00 | 0 | 0.00 | , | 0.55 | 100.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 |
| 26 |  | 0 | 0.00 | 0 | 0.00 | 0 | 0.00 | 0 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 |


| FOTLL: | 558 | 100.00 | 253 | 100.00 | 274 | 100.00 | 1085 | -100.00 |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |

A7E: $22 \quad 16 \quad 16$

Hote: P-strittly funds-related activities
L-strictly loans-related activities
PCodet - see personel classification code for description (Appendix 2).
Source: Conparative Bank Study, 1987.
percent of their transaction cost comes from lending operations. RBs, on the other hand, have a greater bulk of their transaction cost in lending, 47.8 percent, against only 38.2 percent for their funds-mobilization activities. PDBs have almost the same transaction cost for its lending operations, 38.6 percent, and deposit mobilization activities, 36.8 percent. KBs being only a part of a nationwide bank network act as collecting stations by mobilizing and raising funds for their head offices (see Relampagos [1988]). Obviously, the emphasis is to generate as much funds from the public for their head offices. In contrast, RBs being unit banks perform a fully dual operation of funds mobilization and lending operations with emphasis on the latter. Furthermore, RBs rely more heavily, than KBs or PDBs, on funds from the Central Bank's rediscounting window and from special lending programs. This is shown by a bigger percentage of KBs transaction cost coming from activities related to dealings with bank depositors and clients, 29.5 percent, against RBs 9.6 percent only. On the other hand, RBs have a higher percentage of their transaction cost in activities dealing with the $C B, 6.7$ percent, compared to KBs only 2.6 percent. PDBs like KBs, incur substantially more costs on deposit-mobilization from the public than in obtaining rediscounted funds from the central Bank.

The above finding is further supported by the percentage of time-allocation of personnel of the different bank types between funds-mobilization and lending activities (see Table 7). About 60 percent of total personnel time by KBs are devoted to fundsmobilization against only 15.6 percent for lending operations.

## Table 7. PERSONNEL TIME-ALLOCATION <br> (percentage)

|  | 山L M18 |  |  | Hs |  |  | Piss |  |  | 1 H |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | wighted shures | $4 t$ | 4st | reighted mintes | ist | ist | reishted shares | 4 ta | 4t | veithted shates | 4 f | ist |
| TOELC LIMDILIE: | 121782.4 | 23.97 | 100 | 319797.8 | 15.57 | 100 | 175612.0 | 33.71 | 100 | 226372.5 | 51.14 | 100 |
| Planim 4 Programis | 58044.60 | 1.93 | 8.04 | 35804.03 | 1.15 | 11.22 | 9039.119 | 1.76 | 5.15 | 13090.65 | 2.99 | 5.78 |
| Ids 1 Proma | 19338.42 | 0.61 | 2.68 | 7661.925 | 0.37 | 2.40 | 5109.275 | 0.91 | 2.91 | 6567.229 | 1.50 | 2.90 |
| Ittervier of Leplicatt | 93890.10 | 2.12 | 8.85 | 28031.90 | 1.36 | 1.11 | 16099.04 | 3.10 | 9.17 | 19759.16 | 4.58 | 8.13 |
| Gredit Investination | 11240.63 | 2.56 | 10.70 | 39664.30 | 1.93 | 12.40 | 1773.77 | 3.11 | 10.09 | 19952.55 | 4.54 | 8.17 |
| Pratution 4 malysis | 8247.51 | 2.1 | 11.42 | 42042.92 | 2.05 | 13.15 | 11630.92 | 2.4 | 6.62 | 28773.67 | 6.58 | 12.71 |
| Ditburseneat | 43556.87 | 1.45 | 6.03 | 16341.57 | 0.00 | 5.11 | 12734.60 | 2.45 | 7.25 | 4440.68 | 3.31 | 6.40 |
| Hoitorins | 3458.63 | 1.31 | 5.41 | 26621.50 | 1.20 | 1.70 | 7999.025 | 1.40 | 4.38 | 7138.100 | 1.63 | 3.15 |
| Collection | 61279.38 | 2.03 | 8.49 | 21603.13 | 1.06 | 6.78 | 2171.17 | 4.19 | 12.40 | 17822.07 | 4.01 | 7.87 |
| Record-teepis/leport-vritisy | 111525.2 | 3.70 | 15.45 | 4352.52 | 2.16 | 13.81 | 32107.63 | 6.17 | 18.28 | 35065.01 | 8.01 | 15.49 |
| Hut, of bad debts | 50836.83 | 1.69 | 1.06 | 11332.47 | 0.69 | 4.42 | 16372.38 | 3.15 | 9.32 | 20331.97 | 4.65 | 8.98 |
| Uupecified | 14618.9 | 3.19 | 15.80 | 45379.00 | 2.21 | 11.19 | 25322.10 | 4.87 | 14.42 | 43317.06 | 9.90 | 19.16 |
| ITSESTETIS | 18661.81 | 0.62 |  | 3330.115 | 0.16 |  | 7687.65 | 1.48 |  | 764.049 | 1.75 |  |
| tubst oramions | 10372.14 | 0.61 |  | 13311.56 | 0.65 |  | 477.55 | 0.92 |  | 273.5495 | 0.06 |  |
|  | 1577807. | 52.39 | 100 | 1222778. | 59.53 | 100 | 210675.1 | 10.51 | 100 | 14939.9 | 32.99 | 100 |
| frametion rith Ci,other bash | 108677.6 | 3.61 | 6.89 | 7073.54 | 3.4 | 5.79 | 13658.79 | 2.66 | 6.58 | 24085.31 | 5.50 | 16.68 |
| frasections nith Deporitors | 737788.3 | 24.50 | 46.76 | 607134.9 | 29.56 | 49.65 | 95340.32 | 18.33 | 45.25 | 35313.21 | 8.01 | 24.46 |
| Iecord-heepis | 37124.6 | 12.33 | 23.53 | 290563.4 | 14.15 | 23.16 | 53091.58 | 10.21 | 25.20 | 27629.61 | 6.31 | 19.16 |
| Puds-trumfer | 19859.19 | 2.65 | 5.06 | 65379.52 | 3.18 | 5.35 | 11650.43 | 2.28 | 5.62 | 2629.133 | 0.60 | 1.82 |
| dids 6 Prome | 101347.4 | 3.31 | 6.42 | 75365.49 | 3.67 | 6.16 | 16769.72 | 3.12 | 1.96 | 9212.212 | 2.11 | 6.38 |
| Onspecified | 178588.3 | 5.93 | 11.38 | 113565 | 5.53 | 9.29 | 19519.62 | 3.15 | 9.27 | 45483.11 | 10.39 | 31.51 |
| cemell Mimimitiolsavicss | 675014.1 | 22.41 |  | 49773.1 | 24.09 |  | 121330.5 | 23.33 |  | 58910.52 | 13.66 |  |
| Arand mill | 3011638. | 100.00 |  | 2053991. | 100 |  | 520093.1 | 100 |  | 43754.5 | 100 |  |

flote: st - anad total
st: alb-total
Source: Conarative Iank ftudy, 1987.

In contrast, RBs have only 33.0 percent of total personnel time in funds-mobilization but 51.7 percent of total personnel time in lending operations. PDBs also have a greater portion of their personnel time allocated to funds-mobilization (40.5\%) than to lending operations (33.8\%).

In terms of personnel distribution (see Table 6), KBs have more of their total personnel in funds-mobilization activities, 44.2 percent, and only 7.0 percent in lending activities. But RBs have only 11.0 percent of their personnel involved in funds-mobilization activities against 23.4 percent of their personnel in lending operations.

In summary, RBs concentrate more in their lending activities compared to KBs. This is supported by RBs' personnel time allocation and distribution in favor of their lending operations. PDBs have a more balanced operations between fundsmobilization and lending operations as evidenced by their equal share in costs between these two operations. For KBs and PDBs, their lending operations and activities are shared with the head offices to the extent that they are given only a certain level of amount of authority in lending beyond which only their regional or head offices already assume the decision. RBs are unit banks performing both funds-mobilization and lending perhaps with a strong emphasis on the latter. This is explained by the role of RBs as conduits, and to some extent PDBs, for the various special-lending programs of the Central Bank.

## 2. TRANSACTION COST OF LENDING

The transaction cost of lending by a bank may be decomposed into two major components: loan processing cost and loan recovery cost. Considering the composition of the total lending costs (see Table 8) of the 49 banks in the sample about 41.3 percent of lending cost comes mainly from loan recovery efforts such as monitoring of loans, collection, recordkeeping and management of bad debts. Loan processing activities from interview of credit applicants, credit investigation, evaluation and analysis and loan disbursement account for 30.5 percent of total lending costs.

By bank types, the contribution of loan processing activities to total lending cost is 28.5 percent for PDBs and 28.7 percent for RBs, noting almost no difference in their loan processing costs in relation to their total lending costs. On the other hand, about 32.7 percent of KBs ' lending costs are accounted for by loan processing activities. This contrast indicates that KBs devote more resources to loan processing before approval and disbursement.

It is important to note, however, that despite RBs and PDBs having the same loan processing costs relative to their total lending cost, there is a difference in their costs arising from credit investigation and evaluation/analysis of loans. Compared to RBs, KBs and PDBs have their loan processing costs accounted more by credit investigation, 12.5 percent for KBs and 13.1 percent from PDBs, against only 8.0 percent for

## Table 8. LENDING COSTS <br> (in thousand pesos)

|  | All ganks |  | KBs |  | POR5 |  | 885 |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Pesos | $\%$ | Pe50s | 7 | Pesos | $\%$ | Pegos | \% |
| total lendimg costs: | 20694.47 | 100.00 | 9503.33 | 100.00 | 5401.50 | 100.00 | 5789.64 | 100.00 |
| Planning t Programaing | 1468.17 | 7.09 | 902.52 | 9.50 | 233.83 | 4.33 | 331.82 | 5.73 |
| Ads 8 Proeo | 440.33 | 2.13 | 162.58 | 1.71 | 115.65 | 2.14 | 162,10 | 2:80 |
| Disbur senent | 1054.60 | 5.10 | 412.11 | 4.34 | 286.98 | 5.31 | 355.51 | 6.14 |
| Unsperified | 2886.99 | 13.95 | 1128.10 | 11.87 | 677.95 | 12.55 | 1091.04 | 18.67 |
| Loan Pracessing: |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Intervien of Applicants | 1646.16 | 7.95 | 693.84 | 7.30 | 446.38 | 8.26 | 505.94 | 8.74 |
| Credit Investigation | 7356.23 | 11.39 | 1186.04 | 12.48 | 709.37 | 13.13 | 460.97 | 7.96 |
| Evaluation't Analysis | 2305.38 | 11.14 | 1229.27 | 12.94 | 382.41 | 7.68 | $+3.70$ | 11.98 |
|  | 6307.76 | 30.48 | 3109.15 | 32.72 | 1538.11 | 28.48 | 1660. 50 | 28.68 |
| Lean Recovery: |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| monitoring | 1054.95 | 5.10 | 641.08 | 6.75 | 212.53 | 3.93 | 201.44 | 3.48 |
| Collection | 1526.89 | 7.38 | 518.33 | 5.45 | 560.96 | 10.39 | 447.60 | 3.73 |
| Record-keeping/heport-Hriting | 2384.19 | 13.95 | 1148.54 | 12.09 | 880.90 | 16.31 | 856.75 | 14.80 |
| Higt. of bad debts | 3068.59 | 14.83 | 1880.91 | 15.58 | 894.79 | 16.57 | 692.89 | \$1.97 |
|  | 8536.63 | 41.25 | 3788.86 | 39.97 | 2549.08 | 47.19 | 2198.68 | 37.99 |

Source : Coaparative Bank Study,1987.

RBs (see Table 8). On the other hand, RBs give more emphasis to the evaluation/ analysis of loans than PDBs.

Given that the characteristic of their borrowers may serve to explain the difference in credit investigation cost, a comparison of the number of loans granted to repeat borrowers was made. It is expected that a bank with more repeat borrowers would spend less on credit investigation cost since it is likely that the security offered by the repeating borrowers is the same as when he has previousiy applied for the loan not to mention the fact that the bank already knows other important characteristics of the borrower.

Table 9 shows that KBs and PDBs have on the average 24 and 61 repeat borrowers per year respectively, compared to RBs with an average of 641 repeat borrowers per year. In Table 10, a KB on the average received 38 loan applications of which 24 (63.1\%) were repeat borrowers. RBs have an average of 641 repeat borrowers out of an average of 1,023 loan applications, or 62 percent. Given the almost similar ratio of repeat borrowers to total applications, it can be said that the difference in credit investigation cost between KBs and PDBs on one hand and RBs on the other is not due to the frequency of repeat borrowers in the banks, portfolios.

Table 11 indicates that $K B s$ and $P D B s$ require higher loan-to-collateral ratios than RBs. The average loan amount is 61 percent of the collateral for KBs and 58 percent of the

## Table 9. LOAN APPLICATIONS



Source : Comparative Eank Study; 1787.

Table 10. NUMBER OF REPEAT BORROWERS

|  | ALL BANKS |  | K $\mathrm{H}_{5}$ |  | PBAs |  | $8 \mathrm{RH}_{5}$ |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| BRRFOMERS | Hisaber | \% | Husber | 4 | Number | $\%$ | Number | 7 |
| 0 | 3 | 6.82 | 2 | 11.11 | 0 | 0.00 | 1 | 7.69 |
| 50 | 36 | 59.09 | 15 | 83.33 | 11 | 84.62 | 0 | 0.00 |
| 100 | 2 | 4.55 | 1 | 5.56 | 0 | 0.00 | 1 | 7.69 |
| 150 | 1 | 2.27 | 0 | 0.00 | 0 | 0.00 | 1 | 7.69 |
| 200 | 2 | 4.55 | 0 | 0.009 | 2 | 15.38 | 0 | 0.00 |
| 256 | 0 | 0.00 | 0 | 0.00 | 0 | 0.00 | 0 | 0.00 |
| 30. | 0 | 0.60 | 0 | 0.00 | 0 | 0.00 | 0 | 0.00 |
| 3044 | 10 | 22.73 | 0 | 0.00 | 0 | 0.00 | 10 | 76.92 |
| T0TAL: | 44 | 100.00 | 18 | 100.00 | 13 | 100.00 | 13 | 100.00 |
| AYE: |  |  | 24 |  | 61 |  | 64] |  |
| Sil: |  |  | 47 |  | 113 |  | 465 |  |
| URR: |  |  | 2169 |  | 12744 |  | 215968 |  |
| HIN: <br> max: | 0 1590 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |

Source: Coaparative Bank Study,1987.

Table 11. LOAN TO COLLATERAL RATIO

|  | ALL BANKS |  | K 85 |  | POR |  | $\mathrm{RR}_{5}$ |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Loan as y of Collateral | Humber | 4 | Kumber | \% | Wumber | 8 | Rumber | \% |
| 0 | 1 | 2.33 | 0 | 0.00 | 1 | 7.14 | 0 | 0.00 |
| 25\% or less | 1 | 2.33 | 0 | 0.00 | 1 | 7.14 | 0 | 0.00 |
| 50\% of less | 14 | 37.56 | 6 | 37.50 | 3 | 21.43 | 5 | 38.46 |
| 754 or 3 e5s | 22 | 51.16 | 3 | 50.00 | 6 | 42.85 | 8 | 61.54 |
| 100\% or ]ese | 5 | 31.63 | 2 | 12.50 | 3 | 21.43 | 0 | 0.00 |
| $100+$ | 0 | 0.00 | 0 | 0.00 | 0 | 0.00 | 0 | 0,00 |
| TDTAP: | 43 | 100.00 | 16 | 100.00 | 14 | 100.00 | 13 | 100.00 |
| \$ 46 | 59 |  | - 31 |  | 58 |  | 57 |  |
| Sil: | 20 |  | 16 |  | 26 |  | 15 |  |

Source: Comparative Fank Study, 9797,
collateral for PDBs. RBs, on the other hand, give loan values of 57 percent, on average, of the collateral offered. The fact that KBs and PDB have more commercial loans in their portfolio, usually of larger amounts than agricultural loans probably explain the importance of credit investigation, i.e., inspection and appraisal to ascertain the true value and authenticity of the collateral offered in these banks. As shown in Table 7 , KBs and PDBs allocated a higher percentage of personnel time to credit investigation activities, 12.4 percent and 10.1 percent for KBs and PDBs , respectively, against only 8.8 percent for RBs.

Part of the credit investigation cost of loan processing is also accounted for by insurance premia paid by these banks to the special lending programs. Table 12 shows that not a single RB has paid guarantee fees to these programs indicating that they have not participated in these programs or that they are not accredited at all. On the other hand, KBs and PDB s have paid guarantee fees from民20,000 to as high as 16160,000 . On average, PDBs pay 221,707 of guarantee fees while KBs pay $\mathbb{1 1}$,608. This guarantee fees contribute further to their credit investigation cost. Likewise, participation in these programs may require additional credit investigation work by these programs which would again partially contribute to the higher personnel cost in loan processing among KBs and PDBs compared to RBs:

[^0]
# Table 12. GUARANTEE FEES <br> (in thousand pesos) 



Source: Incowe and Expence Statements, Dec. 1986.

Table 8 showed that the incidence of loan recovery costs in total lending costs is slightly higher for KBs (39.9\%) and much higher for PDBs (47.2\%) than for RBs (38.0\%). Although rural banks service more loan accounts, but smaller in loan value, than either PDBs or KBs, the higher loan recovery costs incurred by KBs and PDBs is due to the importance of loan recovery operations to these banks due to the larger exposure by KBs and PDBs to commercial loans than agricultural loans, the former loans being larger in amount. Among bank types, KBs and PDBs incur higher risk-related costs related to management of bad debts such as default expenses, litigation and provisions for bad debts. On the average, a KB incurs $\mathrm{F} 46,665$ in risk-related costs whereas a PDB and a RB incur about 18,682 and 212,759 , respectively (see Table 13). The difference in cost may be due to the higher loan values for KBs and PDBs compared to RBs. Another possible explanation is that the higher loan recovery cost especially for PDBs may be dictated by the requirements of the guarantee programs for monitoring and report-writing. A higher percentage of loan recovery cost is attributed to record-keeping and report writing, and management of bad debts for both KBs and PDBs. PDBs incur the highest loan recovery costs relative to the total lending costs as they have more exposure to the guarantee programs among the three bank types. Further, the higher loan recovery cost among KBs and PDBs may be due to the dependence of the head offices on their branches for collection and management of loan accounts.

Table 13. RISK-RELATED EXPENSES
(in thousand pesos)

| Provisions For Litigation Bad Mehts Expenses | ALI BAMS |  | K悬 |  | P945 |  | R95 |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Husber | \% | Hugher | 4 | Nusbey | 4 | Wuaber | 4 |
| 0 | 25 | 39.06 | 11 | 42,31 | 8 | 50.00 | 6 | 27.27 |
| 25 or less | 23 | 35.94 | , | 2.92 | 4 | 25.00 | 12 | 54.55 |
| 50 or less | 6 | 9,38 | 2 | 7.69 | 1 | 6.25 | 3 | 13.64 |
| 75 or less | 3 | 4.69 | 1 | 3.85 | 1 | 3.25 | ! | 4.85 |
| 100 or $\}$ ess | 3 | 4.69 | 1 | 3,85 | 2 | 12.50 | 0 | 0.00 |
| 125 or 3ess | 0 | 0.04 | 0 | 0,48 | 0 | 0.06 | 0 | 0.00 |
| 150 or less | 0 | 0.6 | , | 0.90 | 0 | 0.00 | 0 | 0.00 |
| 200 or lese | n | 0.04 | 3 | 0.60 | 0 | 0.00 | 0 | 0.00 |
| 200 ar less | 1 | 1.6 | 1 | 3.85 | 0 | 0.00 | 0 | 0.00 |
| 2250 of ${ }^{\text {es }} 5$ | 1 | 1.56 | 1 | 3.95 | 0 | 0.00 | 0 | 0.00 |
| 250 or 1 ESE | 2 | 3.13 | 2 | 7.69 | 0 | 0.00 | 0 | 0.00 |
| T0iAl: | 64 | 190. $0^{2}$ | 26 | 100.08 | 16 | 100.00 | 22 | 100.00 |


| AVG; | 27.577 | 46.665 | 12.682 | 12,759 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Gil | 55.839 | 30.511 | 31.378 | 15.565 |
| 4AF: | 3155.603 | 6485.950 | 984.549 | 242.369 |



## 3. TRANSACTION COST OF FUNDS-MOBILIZATION

As shown in Table 14, a greater portion of fundsmobilization cost by all the banks come from deposit-mobilization (47.7\%) and from record-keeping and withdrawal (23.2\%). Costs accounted by activities related to transactions with CB rediscounting are only 6.4 percent of funds-mobilization cost.

By bank types, KBs' and PDBs' funds-mobilization costs are accounted mainly by deposit-mobilization activities as transactions with bank depositors. KBs' deposit-mobilization cost accounts for 52.2 percent of funds-mobilization cost compared to 43.7 percent for PDBs. RBs, on the other hand, have only 25.1 percent of funds-mobilization cost coming from deposit-mobilization. A higher percentage of KBs' and PDBs' funds-mobilization cost is also due to record-keeping and withdrawal. This is to be expected since this cost is related to the servicing of the deposits by clients.

RBs, on the other hand, have a higher percentage of its funds-mobilization cost from activities related to transactions with CB rediscounting window, 17.5 percent, against KBs; 4.6 percent and PDBs' 5.3 percent. This reflects the RBs' reliance on funds from $C B$, and highlights the fact that this reliance is far from costless. In fact, dependence from $C B$ rediscounting window may represent an important cost for the banks.

It has been shown above that a greater percentage of personnel time is allocated to deposit-mobilization activities,

|  | ALL BAMS |  | \% $\mathrm{H}_{5}$ |  | P085 |  | RB5 |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Peses | 2 | Peses | \% | Pesos | \% | Pesas | \% |
| Total | 37010.20 | 100.00 | 27241.04 | 100.00 | 5146.205 | 100.00 | \$627.951 | 109.00 |
| Transactions with $\mathrm{CB}_{\text {g }}$ other banks | 2335,823 | 6.31 | 1250.522 | 4.59 | 274.3954 | 5.33 | 810.9047 | 17.54 |
| Iramsactions with Depositors | 1763.44 | 47.65 | 14223.77 | 52.21 | 2250.752 | 43.74 | 1161.915 | 25.13 |
| Record-keeping | 8569.628 | 23.23 | 6443.389 | 23.65 | 1793.558 | 25.14 | 652.6612 | 19.44 |
| Funds-Tr assfer | 1529.688 | 4.13 | 1098.311 | 4.03 | 355.8993 | 6.72 | 75.47877 | 1.63 |
| Ads ${ }^{\text {E Preno }}$ | 2250.033 | 6.88 | 1552.757 | 5.70 | 380.5763 | 7.40 | 316.6992 | 6.95 |
| Uaspecified | 4663.796 | 12.69 | 2671.773 | 9.81 | 596.7502 | 11.40 | 1405.772 | 30.40 |

Source : Comparative Dank Study,1987.
49.6 percent for $K B s$ and 45.2 percent for PUBs compared to only 24.4 percent for RBs (Table 7). A greater proportion of personnel is also assigned to deposit-mobilization activities by KBs and PDBs compared to RBs (Table 6). This is explained by the greater volume of deposits serviced by both KBs and PDBs compared to RBs. Another factor is that KBs and PDBs have other accounts, such as time-deposits, to service unlike RBs. Overall, the concentration of personnel on deposit-mobilization activities by $K B s$ and $P D B s$ contribute to their higher depositmobilization costs. On the other hand, a greater percentage of personnel time is allocated by RBs to transaction cost with the $C B, 16.7$ percent against KBs and PDBs 3.44 and 2.44 percent respectively

Fines and penalties related to reporting requirements with the $C B$ and in meeting the reserve requirement contributed a greater percentage of RBs' funds-mobilization cost. On the average, this cost is 240,071 for RBs compared to KBs , 24,504 and PDBs' 96,757 (see Table 15). On the other hand, a considerable percentage of $K B s$ and PDBs funds-mobilization cost comes from insurance for their deposits. This is expected since KBs and PDBs have a greater volume of deposits compared to RBs. The average is 266,468 for $K B s, ~ P 15,514$ for PDBs and 212,709 for RBs (see Table 16).

## Table 15. DEPOSIT-RELATED EXPENSES (in thousand pesos)

| ALL BAMS |  |  | K15 |  | PD85 |  | R85 |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Fines : Pemalties | Husber | 4 | Nunber | \% | Wumber | 1 | Number | $\%$ |
| 0 | 24 | 43.64 | 10 | 52.63 | 11 | 78.57 | 3 | 13.64 |
| 20:1e5s | 20 | 36,36 | 7 | 32.84 | 3 | 21.43 | 10 | 45.45 |
| 40 \& less | 2 | 3.64 | 1 | 5.26 | 0 | 0.00 | ; | 4,55 |
| 60 \& 1e5s | 5 | 9.09 | 1 | 5.26 | 0 | 0.00 | 4 | 18.18 |
| 80\% less | 1 | 1.82 | 0 | 0.00 | 0 | 0.00 | 1 | 4.55 |
| 100 \& 3 ess | 0 | 0.00 | 0 | 0.00 | 0 | 0.00 | 0 | 0.00 |
| 1044 | 3 | 5.45 | 0 | 0.00 | 0 | 0.00 | 3 | 33.64 |
| 707AL: | 55 | 100.00 | 19 | 100.00 | 14 | 100.00 | 22 | 300.00 |


| AVG: 17.849 | 4.504 | 6.757 | 40.071 |  |
| ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| SD: | 40.676 | 11.554 | 16.767 | 59.125 |
| VAR: 1654.575 | 133.500 | 281.117 | 3495.871 |  |

MIN: 0
MAX: 188.6

Source : Incose and Expense Statements, Dec. 1986.

## Table 16. DEPOSIT-RELATED EXPENSES (in thousand pesos)

|  | ALL BAMES |  | $\mathrm{K} / 8$ |  | P085 |  | 885 |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Deposit Insurance | Nucher | y | Mucber | 7 | Number | 4 | Wumber | $I$ |
| 0 | 1 | 1.85 | 0 | 0.00 | 1 | 7.14 | 0 | 0.00 |
| 20 \& 1ess | 32 | 59.26 | 3 | 16.67 | 9 | 64.29 | - 20 | 90.91 |
| 40 \& less | 10 | 18.57 | 4 | 22.22 | 4 | 28.57 | 2 | 9.09 |
| 60 t less | 2 | 3.70 | 2 | 11.11 | 0 | 0.00 | 0 | 0.00 |
| 80 \% less | 4 | 7.41 | 4 | 22.22 | 0 | 0.00 | 0 | 0.00 |
| 100\% less | 2 | 3.70 | 2 | 11.11 | 0 | 0.00 | 0 | 0.00 |
| 100\% | 3 | 5.56 | 3 | 16.67 | 0 | 0.00 | 0 | 0.00 |
| 70TAL: | 54 | 100.00 | 18. | 100.00 | 14 | 100.00 | 22 | 100.00 |


| AVE: | 31.356 | 66.468 | 15.514 | 12.709 |
| ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| S0: | 36.926 | 45.490 | 11.216 | 6.277 |
| VAS: | 1356.141 | 2069.379 | 125.803 | 39.399 |

Source: Incoee and Expense Statements, Dec. 1996
4. PER UNIT COST OF LENDING

## Cost Per Loan Account Outstanding

Given the overall cost incurred by banks in its lending operations and considering the total number of outstanding loans in their portfolio, the cost per outstanding loan is about 1,380 per account (see Table 17). This amount represents the cost per loan by all the banks combined. Part of this cost per account comes from processing the new loans granted for the period considered and a bigger part comes frem servicing these new loans in addition to other loans that are already outstanding.

By type of bank, RBs have the lowest cost per loan account, ( 8473 ) than PDBs ( $\mathrm{P} 1,839$ ) and $\mathrm{KBs}(\mathrm{P14,500)}$ (see Table 17). The big difference in cost per loan between KBs and RBs is that not only do KBs incur higher cost in their lending operations but that they have less accounts to service. In contrast, not only do RBs incur less total costs in the lending operations but they also service more accounts. This is typical among rural banks where most loans in their portfolio are small, but numerous. PDBs also nave less number of accounts in their portfolio than RBs although greater than KBs. Most of the loans by RBs are agricultural loans compared to KBs which have predominantiy commercial loans.

|  | ALL GAHKS | K $\mathrm{Bl}_{5}$ | P085 | R $\mathrm{R}_{5}$ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| jatal lending cist: | 1379.92 | 14500.28 | 1839,24 | 473.04 |
| Planming a Programing | 93.86 | 1336.19 | 89.79 | 29.02 |
| Ads t Promo | 33.54 | 201.34 | 58.71 | 13.59 |
| Interview of Applicants | 94.76 | 777.69 | 153.48 | 39.50 |
| Credit lnvestigation | 172.27 | 1894.98 | 291.96 | 39.45 |
| Evaluation \& Analysis | 152.76 | 1821.55 | 81.36 | 67.47 |
| Disturserent | 72.78 | 691.54 | 123.60 | 23.88 |
| Unspecified | 198.56 | 1681.97 | 258.66 | 94.14 |
| Loan Recovery: |  |  |  |  |
| Nonitoring | 67.92 | 985.29 | 78.41 | 9.46 |
| collection | 107.42 | 937.21 | 197.00 | 36.04 |
| Record-keeping/Report-witing | 185.73 | 1724.72 | 328.37 | 59.80 |
| Kg . of bad debts | 20.23 | 2656.98 | 167.91 | 61.69 |
|  | 564.29 | 6305.20 | 771.69 | 165.99 |

[^1]
#### Abstract

Recovery cost associated with all outstanding loans, 2/ is 0564 per account for all of the banks. For RBs the loan recovery cost per account is 2166 against PDBs' 2772 and $K B s^{\prime}$ 26,305. In all aspects of loan recovery operations, i.e., monitoring, collection; record-keeping and management of bad debts, PDBs and KBs incur more costs than RBs (see -- Table 17). For example, the cost of monitoring each account is 278 for PDBs and 2986 for KBs against 89.41 for RBs. It must be recalled that KBs and PDBs put more emphasis on their loan recovery operations due to greater exposure as a result of the larger commercial loans they lend. Further, PDBs and KBs participate in the guarantee programs whereas RBs do not. The difference in their loan servicing cost per account may be due to the importance of loan recovery and the requirements of these guarantee programs for supervision and stricter management of these accounts compared to reģular accounts.


Table 18 reports the average cost per loan granted during the year. It is shown that PDBs and KBs have higher processing cost per loan at $\mathcal{F 1 , 0 2 3}$ and 2,744 , respectively, against RBs' श120. As in the banks' loan recovery cost, all aspects of loan processing cost from screening to credit investigation and loan evaluation is higher among PDBs and KBs compared to RBs. An example would be the credit imvestigation cost per account for

Total loan recovery cost divided by the total number of loans outstanding.

3/
Total loan processing cost divided by total number of loans granted.

Table 18. COST PER LOAN
(in pesos)

|  | All BAMKS | (185 | P095 | R 8 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| TOTAL LERDIMG COST: | 1237.30 | 20176,99 | 3593.81 | 391.02 |
| Plaming : Progt anwing | 71.87 | 1356, 47 | 155.57 | 23.19 |
| Ads : Prows | 25.62 | 283,70 | 76.95 | 11.70 |
| Disbursement | 69.88 | 998.83 | 194,94 | 26.60 |
| Monitoring | 64.97 | 1526.13 | 141.34 | 11.59 |
| Collection | 95.79 | 1238.70 | 37.23 | 27.36 |
| Becord-kepping/Report-writing | 178.41 | 25.40 .00 | 58\%.04 | 37.70 |
| Mgt. of bad debts | 192, 35 | 3440.20 | 595.34 | 47.36 |
| Unsperified | 152.75 | 2049.01 | 451.00 | 60.92 |
| Lean Processing: |  |  |  |  |
| Interview of Applicants | 103.83 | 1583.50 | 292.99 | 36.68 |
| Gredit Investigation | 142.88 | 2543.67 | 471.93 | 32.15 |
| Evaluation \& Analysis | 140.04 | 2617.58 | 254, 45 | 51.44 |
|  | 386.75 | 6744.74 | 1023.36 | 120.27 |

Source : Comparatiye lank Study, 1887.
loan processing activities than REs. This may be partly due to the need for extensive credit investigation and partly due to the guarantee programs that PDBs and KBs have participated in.

## Cost Per Peso Lent

As regards the cost per peso of loan granted and loans outstanding for these banks, a totally different picture emerges. Considering all the banks, the cost per peso loan outstanding is P0.03 (see Table 19). This means that the cost of maintaining each peso of loan outstanding is about three centavos. For each bank type, this cost is 20.06 for REs, 10.03 for PDBs and P0.02 for CBs. Overall, KBs and PDBs have the comparative advantage in lending compared to REs as they are able to keep a lower cost per peso of loan they keep in their portfolio than REs. This is a direct effect of the larger amounts of outstanding loans, in NBs, and PDBs' portfolio than in PBs. What PBs and KBs lack in the number of loan accounts, they make it up by a higher loan amount per account.

The cost of recovering each peso of loan outstanding ${ }^{4 /}$ for each bank is 20.023 for REs, 20.014 for PBs and very negligible for KBs , PO. 008 (see Table 19). Again, the slightly lower loan recovery cost per peso for KBs and PBs compared to RBi is dictated by the bigger volume of loans they service.

Total loan recovery cost divided by the total value of loans outstanding.

Table 19．COST PER PESO LOAN OUTSTANDING （in pesos）

|  |  <br> HA斯 | W | P08s | RES |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Tathe leming cogr | 0.026 | 0.018 | 0.030 | 0.060 |
| Plaming of Programing | 0.007 | 4，001 | 0.001 | 0.003 |
| Ads if Prasb | 6， 009 | 0.100 | 0.101 | 0，002 |
| Interyien of Applicants | 0.062 | 0.001 | 0.1002 | 0.005 |
| Credit Jnvestigatiga | 0.003 | 0.002 | 0.004 | 0.005 |
| Evaluation Analysis | 0.063 | 0,002 | 0.607 | 0.007 |
| 或istur sement | 0，004 | 0.001 | 0.027 | 0.104 |
| Unspecibied | 0.004 | 0.002 | 0.064 | 0.015 |
| Lear fecavery： |  |  |  |  |
| 易粗toring | 0.001 | 3， 0 B4 | 3.001 | 0.002 |
| Coshection | 0.062 | 8.001 | 9，003 | 0.005 |
|  | 0.004 | 0.602 | 0．105 | 0.60 |
| 䊺t．of kad deats | 0，004 | 0.003 | 1．005 | 0．097 |
|  | 4，011 | A008 | 0.014 | 3.023 |

[^2]
#### Abstract

As regards the cost of granting per peso of loan, 5/ across banks do not appear significant. This amounts to 0.013 for RBs, 20.015 for PDBs and 20.0 .15 for KBs (see Table 20). Among the sample banks, RBs granted more loans in value than PDBs given their respective costs which explains the slightly lower per peso cost of granting a loan. On the other hand, slightly higher cost per peso of granting a loan of KBs ' compared to RB s is due to the fact that although KBs granted a higher total value of loans than RBs, KBs incurred higher cost of loan processing compared to RBs. Overall they do not differ in their cost per peso lent. This is an important finding, since it suggests that current $R B$ operations are of similar efficiency, measured by costs per peso lent, compared to KBs and PDBs.


5. PER UNIT COST OF DEPOSIT-MOBILIZATION

## Cost Per Deposit Account

Considering all the banks, their overall cost of mobilizing each deposit account, i.e., opening of new accounts to servicing each account, is 287 (see Table 21).

Most of the cost in mobilizing each deposit account from the public is due to activities directly related to transactions with bank clients or depositors, amounting to $P 52$ per deposit account. Likewise, this deposit-mobilization cost is largely accounted for by record-keeping and withdrawal.

Total loan processing divided by the total value of loan granted.

## Table 20. COST PER PESO LENT (in pesos)



Scurce : Conarative Sank Study; 1987.

Table 21. COST PER DEPOSIT ACCOUNT (in pesos)

|  | ALL BAHKS | $\mathrm{KBF}_{5}$ | Pbis | R85 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Total Deposit-Hobilization Cost | 87.47 | 120.41 | 33.21 | 28.94 |
| Trancartions with Depositors | 52.25 | 75.63 | 36.71 | 13.97 |
| Record-kepping | 23.49 | 30.16 | 22.92 | 10.25 |
| Funds-Tramsfer | 4.49 | 5.65 | 6.50 | 0.91 |
| Ads \& Promo | 7.23 | 8.97 | 7.01 | 3.81 |

By type of bank, the cost of mobilizing each deposit accourrt is higher for KBs and PDBs ( 12120 and F 73 , respectively) compared to RBs (228). The higher cost per deposit for KBs comes from their higher cost in deposit-mobilization relative to the number of deposits attracted.

Much of this cost of mobilizing deposit accounts for all the three bank types come from activities related to servicing new depositors or clients and to keeping each depositor's account with the bank. Servicing each bank depositor includes the opening of new accounts by new clients to over-the-counter transactions with depositors, i.e., withdrawal. Maintaining each account involves record-keeping. For all banks, KBs have an over-the-counter transactions cost of 276 per account and a recordkeeping cost of 830 . PDBs have the second highest cost with P36 and 233 respectively, for over-the-counter transactions with depositors and record-keeping. RBs have 914 and P 10 per account for these deposit-motilization activities.

## Costs Per Peso Mobilized

In contrast, the cost of mobitizing per peso of deposit is lowest for KBs (20.018 per peso), followed by PDBs (20.023) and RBs (20.035) (see Table 22). This means that for KBs, the cost of mobilizing each peso or deposit is 1.8 centavos against PDBs 2.3 centavos and RBs 3.4 centavos.

Tris again shows KBs , comparative advantage in raising a peso of deposit. This can be explained by the larger deposit

Table 22. COST PER PESO DEPOSIT
(in pesos)

|  | $\begin{gathered} \text { RLL } \\ \text { gALKS } \end{gathered}$ | K85 | P085 | 895 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Iotal Deposit-hobilization Cost | 0.023 | 0.018 | 0.023 | 0.035 |
| Iramsartions with Depositors | 0.012 | 0.011 | 0.011 | 0.017 |
| Record-keeping | 0.006 | 0.005 | 0.008 | 0.012 |
| Funds-Iramsfer | 0.001 | 0.001 | 0.002 | 0.001 |
| ads $\%$ Priono | 0.002 | 0.001 | 0.002 | 0.005 |

Source : Comparative lank Study,1997.
balances per account in KBs , although they have smaller number of deposit accounts. Normally, this is expected of KBs which are situated in more prominent locations, such as in relatively welloff communities. In addition, most KBs hold commercial accounts from businesses. PDBs, likewise, have the same advantage over RBs which have more deposit accounts than PDBs although small in value.

## V. SUMMARY AND CONCLUSION

This section summarizes the results obtained from the study and discusses some policy implications.

The major findings of the study are as follows:

1: Funds mobilization activities account for a greater part of total transaction cost among all banks than lending operations. KBs have a larger portion of their transaction cost contributed by funds-mobilization than their lending operations while the opposite is true for RBs. This emphasizes the fact that $K B$ branches are funds-generating units while RBs are more lending oriented. PDBs have a balanced operation on both fundsmobilization and lending.
2. Considering the bank's transaction cost on lending, KBs have a higher percentage of their lending cost accounted for by loan processing compared to PDBs and RBs. This may be due to more intensive credit investigation of collateral offered among KBs. Besides granting smaller amounts per loan, RBs are more familiar with their clientele of small borrowers having only to serve a small service area of borrowers.

Loan recovery cost also accounts for a greater share of lending cost among KBs and PDBs perhaps due to the intensive loan recovery efforts by these banks as a result of their higher exposure given the predominance of commercial loans in their portfolio.
3. As. regards transaction cost on funds-mobilization, a greater part is attributed to deposit-mobilization activities specially among KBs and PDBs. On the other hand, a greater portion of RBs funds-mobilization cost come from mobilizing funds from the $C B$ rediscounting window. This cost are shown to be a substantial component of RBs funds-mobilization cost.
4. The cost per outstanding loan is lowest for RBs and highest for KBs. But the cost per peso of outstanding loan is lowest for KBs and highest for RBs. The cost of granting a loan is lowest for RBs than either PDBs or KBs. The per peso cost of granting a loan, is also lowest for RBs than PDBs or KBs, although the differences among the banks is not significant.
5. The cost of mobilizing each peso of deposit account is higher for KBs and PDBs compared to RBs. In contrast, KBs obtain the lowest cost of mobilizing per peso of deposit, followed by PDBs than RBs. This may again be attributed to the higher volume of deposits mobilized by both KBs and PDBs.

The contrast in the composition of transaction cost among the different bank types particularly KBs and RBs serves to underline the direction of their operations. Being only a part of a larger branch network, KB branches serve as depositmobilizing units for their head offices. Thus, this is shown by the larger portion of their transaction cost in fundsmobilization. On the other hand, RBs which are unit banks can only expect to sorve a limited clientele with less incentive to raise funds from cleposits but more inclined to source funds from

CB. As channel for such funds their emphasis is on lending. But despite the stark contrast of emphasis in their operations, the fact remains that $K B s$ and PDBs with larger operations hold a comparative advantage in either funds-mobilization and lending operations measured by per peso cost of delivery.

Primarily, the problem addressed is the viability of rural financial intermediaries in terms of lower transaction cost most specifically the per unit cost of bringing bank services to the rural sector. The fact that KBs and PDBs have relatively lower cost per peso of loan and cost per peso deposit mobilized than RBs indicates their comparative advantage in both fundsmobilization and lending activities. But this does not necessitate that smaller banks that carry mostly agricultural loans in their portfolio need go into large scale lending in order to reduce their per peso cost. In fact, the results of a related study (see Untalan 1988) reveals that agricultural lending is not a significant determinant of bank transaction cost. It seems more that the extent and leeway of operations by a bank serve as a factor in the deiivery cost per unit for these services as evidenced by the finding of the study of the existence of economies of scale.

Additional capitalization requirements for smaller banks especially among unit banks, would permit these small rural financial intermediaries to expand their operations and improve their performance and viability by exploiting economies of scale in their operations. Bigger operating capacity for smaller banks
would lower their transaction cost and thus effectively lower their average cost of delivery. One way by which these banks could increase their capital base is the removal of the present 25 percent limit on capital subscriptions.

Liberal bank entry will, likewise, prove to be beneficial in reducing transaction cost in the long-run since competition would force rural intermediaries to produce these bank services at the lowest possible cost in order to remain profitable. Perhaps the higher per unit cost among RBs may be due to the lack of incentives to minimize costs in the absence of competition. Likewise, free bank entry would provide these banks a chance to expand their operations: Wider operations for unit banks like RBs provide additional incentives for these banks for expanded lending in terms of the number of loans by serving other areas and for these to strengthen their deposit-mobilization rather than just merely serving as conduit banks for special funds thus effectively lower their funds-mobilization cost. A higher volume of deposits of the same cost could lower the cost per peso of deposit. In other words, banks when provided incentives to expand their operations can improve their performance by taking advantage of the presence of economies of scale.

Perhaps, the profitability and viability of rural financial intermediaries can also be directly addressed by looking into factors affecting bank transaction cost. One way of lowering transaction cost is through improvements in farm productivity. This directly lowers the risk faced by banks. It is common
knowledge that this risk comes from the beneficiaries of credit in this case the rural households in the form of lower repaying capacity.

Improvements in infrastructure such as farm to market roads, irrigation, availability of better farm inputs and equipments, better education to farmers of modern techniques of farming, marketing assistance, and appropriate pricing policies will go a 7ong way in increasing farm productivity and improving the incomes of rural households. These reduce risk-related costs of rurat financial intermediaries, and thus their transaction cost.

Further, improvement of rural household income would "monetize" an otherwise dormant-sector of the economy thus giving incentives for these households to seek for more credit which can be translated not only in terms of the increased number of loans by the banks but an increase in the size of the loan as well. Both have decreasing effects in the per unit and per peso cost of delivery for these rural financial intermediaries.
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## Appendix 1

A. LENDING OPERATIONS:

1. Planning and Programming (e.g. setting-up of loan targets/programs)
2. Advertising and Promotions
3. Interview of Credit Applicants/Examination of Loan Applications
4. Credit Investigation (e.g. inspection/appraisal
of collateral; examination of bank)
5. Evaluation/Analysis and Approval of Loans
6. Disbursement of Loan
7. Monitoring of Loans Including Technical Assistance
8. Collection of Loans
9. Record -keeping and Report-writing
10. Management of Bad Debts
B. INVESTMENTS
C. TRUST OPERATIONS
D. FUNDS-MOBILIZATION:
11. Transactions with the Central Bank/other banks
12. Transactions with Bank Depositors
13. Record-keeping and Withdrawal
14. Funds-Transfer Operations
15. Advertising and Promotions
E. GENERAL ADMINISTRATION/SERVICES

> (e.g. typing, delivery/messengerial activities, maintenance/utility)

## Appendix 2

Personnel Classification Code

| Code | Bank Personnel/Positions |
| :---: | :---: |
| 1 | Chairman |
| 2. | Vice-Chairman |
| 3. | Directors/President |
| 4 | Board Secretary/Treasurer |
| 5. | Manager/President-Manager |
| 6 | Assistant Manager/Branch Operations Manager/ Branch Operations Officer |
| 7. | Cashier/Assistant Cashier/Cash Clerk |
| 8. | Branch Accountant/Accountant/General Bookkeeper/ Assistant General Bookkeeper |
| 9. | Loans Officer/Account Officer/Credit Administrator |
| 10. | Senior Teller/Head Teller/General Teller/PR Teller/Field Teller New Accounts/Savings |
|  | Pro/Customer Relations Assistant |
| 11. | FX Clerk/CTD Clerk/Sundries Clerk |
| 12. | CA Bookkeeper/SA Bookkeeper/Supervising <br> Bookkeeper/Junior or Senior Bookkeeper/Liability <br> Bookkeeper/CTD Bookkeeper/Posting Clerk/ <br> Proofsheet/Accounting Clerk (Funds) |
| 13. | Proofsheet/Accounting Clerk (Funds) <br> Clearing Clerk/Batching Clerk/Distributing Clerk |
| 14. | Loans Analyst/Loan Processor/Loan Clerk/Credit Investigator/ Credit Analyst/Financial Analyst/ Clerk/Loans-Rediscount Clerk |
| 15. | Loans bookkeeper/Accounting Clerk (Loans)/ Subsidiary-ledger Bookkeeper/Filing Clerk |
| 16. | Inspector/Technician/Farm or Credit Technician/ Production Technician |
| 17. | Settling Clerk/Branch Courier/Messenger/Utility Clerk |
| 18. | Secretary/Clerk Typist |
| 19. | Driver/Janitor/Messenger/Security Guards |
| 20. | Appraiser/Costing Clerk |
| 21. | Collector |
| 22. | Property-Liaison Clerk |
| 23. | Acquired Asset Administrator |
| 24. | Administrative Assistant/Personnel Pro |
| 25. | Money Shop Manager/Money Shop Supervisor |

A. Where the personne1/position differs by name but having more or less similar functions, these are grouped together as one classification and assigned one variable.
ex. 1 Senior Teller, Head Teller, General Teller ex. 2 Loans Analyst, Loans processor, Loans Clerk
B. Where the personnel/position differe slightly in functions but can be categorized as one general office function or activity these are assigned one variable, i.e. deposit-taking, these are grouped together in one classification.
ex. 1. Senior Teller, Field Teller, New Account Clerk, Savings Personnel
ex. 2. Inspector, Farm Technician, Credit Technician, Production Technician
ex 3. Current Account Bookkeeper, Savings Account Bookkeeper, Certificate of Time Deposit Bookkeeper, Posting Clerk (Savings)
C. For personnel/positions that belong to the same classification as to deposit-taking or lending, but differ in rank, i.e. officer-positions vs. rank and file, these are assigned one variable.
ex. Branch Accountant, Accountant, General Bookkeeper, Assistant General Bookkeeper (8) vs. C.A. Bookkeeper, S.A. Bookkeeper, Supervising Bookkeeper, Jr. and Sr. Bookkeeper, Accounting Clerk (Deposit).
D. For positions that have general descriptions but involving completely different office function on activity, segregation is made by noting the \% of their time devoted to the major functions i.e. deposits or lending.
ex. Accounting Clerk (Deposit-taking) Accounting Clerk (lending operations)
E. Other positions which are distinctly attributed to a particular bank are assigned separate variables to avoid arbitrary lumping or classification.
ex. PCIB Money Shop Manager/PCIB Money Shop Supervisor The above insures that the grouping of personnel performing similar or slightly different office activities belong to the same major office functions

```
activity as required in the time allocation table (A)
Lending, (B) Investiment (C) Deposit-taking, (E)
General Administrative. The above guidelines were
based on job descriptions of each personnel and/or by
noting the amount of time allocated to each of the
major office function, (A) - (E).
```

Majority of the banks surveyed do not have a complete matching of time-allocation of each personnel against the corresponding compensation of such personnel. In order that whatever existing information on these banks can be used, values for these missing data were generated and the following guidelines were followed:
A. Positions with no compensation but with time-allocation 1. RBs - averaging all compesation for that particular position across all RBs and taking into consideration that the resulting compensation is within the salary range for the bank in question i.e. the computed compensation for teller of RB1 must not be higher than the compensation of the cashier of the same bank. Otherwise, re-calculation is made by deleting the nighest compensation value in the sample until the computed compensation is within RB1 salary range.
2. $\mathrm{KBs} /$

$$
\begin{aligned}
& \text { PDBs - averaging all compensation for that } \\
& \quad \text { particular positions using only existing } \\
& \text { values of branches of that bank under } \\
& \text { consideration i.e. teller position BPI } \\
& \text { San Pablo generated using compensation } \\
& \text { of other teller positions of other BPI } \\
& \text { branches. }
\end{aligned}
$$

B. Positions with no time-allocation but with compensation 1. RBs - averaging time-aliocation of that particular positions across all RBs, i.e. time allocation of manager is computed by averaging all time allocation for managers by all RBs.
2. KBs/

PDbs
averaging all time-allocation for that particular position using timeallocation of personnel from other branches of the same bank.
C. Officer Positions with no time-allocation

1. RBs - for positions of Chairman, ViceChairman, Board Members that have no time allocation, values are given using equal time allocation of 50 percent for lending and 50 percent for depositmobilization.
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[^0]:    These were mostly fees to the crop insurance program.

[^1]:    Source : Comparative fiank Study, 1987.

[^2]:    Source ：Comperative Gank Study， 197.

